

I was recently made aware of Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election. Considering the scope of the Sinclair network this constitutes an unfair ability for one corporation to sway the political process nationally. Sinclair has chosen to provide what amount to free advertising for their presidential choice. This is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.